arXiv:1602.07509v2 [math.LO] 7 Apr 2016

Computability and Analysis, a Historical Approach

Vasco Brattka[1,2⋆]

[1] Faculty of Computer Science, Universität der Bundeswehr München, Germany
[2] Dept. of Mathematics & App. Maths., University of Cape Town, South Africa
Vasco.Brattka@cca-net.de

Abstract. The history of computability theory and and the history of analysis are surprisingly intertwined since the beginning of the twentieth century. For one, Émil Borel discussed his ideas on computable real number functions in his introduction to measure theory. On the other hand, Alan Turing had computable real numbers in mind when he introduced his now famous machine model. Here we want to focus on a particular aspect of computability and analysis, namely on computability properties of theorems from analysis. This is a topic that emerged already in early work of Turing, Specker and other pioneers of computable analysis and eventually leads us to the very recent project of classifying the computational content of theorems in the Weihrauch lattice.

1 Introduction

Probably Émil Borel was the first mathematician who had an intuitive understanding of computable real number functions and he anticipated some basic ideas of computable analysis as early as at the beginning of the 20th century. It was in his introduction to measure theory where he felt the need to discuss such concepts and we can find for instance the following crucial observation in [5,6].

Theorem 1 (Borel 1912). *Every computable real number function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is continuous.*

Strictly speaking, Borel's definition of a computable real number function was a slight variant of the modern definition (see [2] for details and translations) and his definition was informal in the sense that no rigorous notion of computability or of an algorithm was available at Borel's time.

It was only Alan Turing who introduced such a notion with the help of his now famous machine model [43,44]. Interestingly, also Turing was primarily interested in computable real numbers (hence the title of his paper!) and not so much in functions and sets on natural numbers that are the main objects of study in modern computability theory. Turing's definition of a computable

⋆ Vasco Brattka is supported by the National Research Foundation of South Africa. This article uses some historical insights that were established in [2].

real number function is also a slight variant of the modern definition (see [2] for details).

We conclude that computability theory was intertwined with analysis since its early years and here we want to focus on a particular aspect of this story that is related to computability properties of theorems in analysis, which are one subject of interest in modern computable analysis [38,27,45,17].

2 Some Theorems from Real Analysis

In his early work [43] Turing already implicitly discussed the computational content of some classical theorems from analysis. Some of his rather informal observations have been made precise later by Specker and others [2]. Ernst Specker was probably the first one who actually gave a definition of computable real number functions that is equivalent to the modern one [41,42]. The following theorem is one of those theorems that are implicitly discussed by Turing in [43].

Theorem 2 (Monotone Convergence Theorem). *Every monotone increasing and bounded sequence of real numbers $(x_n)_n$ has a least upper bound* $\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} x_n$.

What Turing observed (without proof) is that for a computable sequence $(x_n)_n$ of this type the least upper bound is not necessarily computable. A rigorous proof of this result was presented only ten years later by Specker [41].

Proposition 3 (Turing 1937, Specker 1949). *There is a computable monotone increasing and bounded sequence $(x_n)_n$ of real numbers such that $x = \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} x_n$ is not computable.*

Specker used (an enumeration of) the halting problem $K \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ to construct a corresponding sequence $(x_n)_n$ and such sequences are nowadays called *Specker sequences*. Then the corresponding non-computable least upper bound is $x = \sum_{i\in K} 2^{-i}$. While the Monotone Convergence Theorem is an example of a non-computable theorem, Turing also discusses a (special case) of the Intermediate Value Theorem [43], which is somewhat better behaved.

Theorem 4 (Intermediate Value Theorem). *Every continuous function $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ with $f(0) \cdot f(1) < 0$ has a zero $x \in [0,1]$.*

And then Turing's observation, which was stated for the general case by Specker [42] could be phrased in modern terms as follows.

Proposition 5 (Turing 1937, Specker 1959). *Every computable function $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ with $f(0) \cdot f(1) < 0$ has a computable zero $x \in [0,1]$.*

A rigorous proof could utilize the trisection method, a constructive variant of the well-known bisection method and can be found in [45]. Hence, while the Monotone Convergence Theorem does not hold computably, the Intermediate Value Theorem does hold computably, at least in a *non uniform* sense. It was claimed by Specker [42] (without proof) and later proved by Pour-El and Richards [38] that this situation changes if one considers a sequential version of the Intermediate Value Theorem.

Proposition 6 (Specker 1959, Pour-El and Richards 1989). *There exists a computable sequence $(f_n)_n$ of computable functions $f_n : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ with $f_n(0) \cdot f_n(1) < 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and such that there is no computable sequence $(x_n)_n$ of real numbers $x_n \in [0,1]$ with $f_n(x_n) = 0$.*

For their proof Pour-El and Richards used two c.e. sets that are computably inseparable. Their result indicates that the Intermediate Value Theorem does not hold computably in a *uniform* sense. In fact, it is known that the Intermediate Value Theorem is not computable in the following fully uniform sense: namely, there is no algorithm that given a program for $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ with $f(0) \cdot f(1) < 0$ produces a zero of f. Nowadays, we can express this as follows with a partial multi-valued map [45].

Proposition 7 (Weihrauch 2000). $\mathsf{IVT} :\subseteq \mathcal{C}[0,1] \rightrightarrows [0,1], f \mapsto f^{-1}\{0\}$ *with* $\mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{IVT}) = \{f \in \mathcal{C}[0,1] : f(0) \cdot f(1) < 0\}$ *is not computable.*

For general represented spaces X, Y we denote by $\mathcal{C}(X,Y)$ the space of continuous functions $f : X \to Y$ endowed with a suitable representation [45] (and the compact open topology) and we use the abbreviation $\mathcal{C}(X) := \mathcal{C}(X, \mathbb{R})$. In fact, IVT is not even continuous and this observation is related to the fact that the Intermediate Value Theorem has no constructive proof [4].

Another theorem discussed by Specker [42] is the Theorem of the Maximum.

Theorem 8 (Theorem of the Maximum). *For every continuous function $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ there exists a point $x \in [0,1]$ such that $f(x) = \max f([0,1])$.*

Grzegorczyk [22] raised the question whether every computable function $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ attains its maximum at a computable point. This question was answered in the negative by Lacombe [29] (without proof) and later independent proofs were provided by Lacombe [30, Theorem VI and VII] and Specker [42].

Proposition 9 (Lacombe 1957, Specker 1959). *There exists a computable function $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ such that there is no computable $x \in [0,1]$ with $f(x) = \max f([0,1])$.*

Similar results have also been derived by Zaslavskiĭ [46]. Specker used a Kleene tree for his construction of a counterexample. A Kleene tree is a computable counterexample to Weak Kőnig's Lemma.

Theorem 10 (Weak Kőnig's Lemma). *Every infinite binary tree has an infinite path.*

Kleene [26] has proved that such counterexamples exist and (like Proposition 6) this can be easily achieved using two computably inseparable c.e. sets.

Proposition 11 (Kleene 1952). *There exists a computable infinite binary tree without computable paths.*

It is interesting to note that even though computable infinite binary trees do not need to have computable infinite paths, they do at least have paths that are *low*, which means that the halting problem relative to this path is not more difficult than the ordinary halting problem. In this sense low paths are "almost computable". The existence of such solutions has been proved by Jockusch and Soare in their now famous Low Basis Theorem [25].

Theorem 12 (Low Basis Theorem of Jockusch and Soare 1972). *Every computable infinite binary tree has a low path.*

Such low solutions also exist in case of the Theorem of the Maximum 8 for computable instances. The Monotone Convergence Theorem 2 is an example of a theorem where not even low solutions exist in general, e.g., Specker's sequence is already an example of a computable monotone and bounded sequence with a least upper bound that is equivalent to the halting problem and hence not low.

Another case similar to the Theorem of the Maximum is the Brouwer Fixed Point Theorem.

Theorem 13 (Brouwer Fixed Point Theorem). *For every continuous function $f : [0,1]^k \to [0,1]^k$ there exists a point $x \in [0,1]^k$ such that $f(x) = x$.*

It is an ironic coincidence that Brouwer, who was a strong proponent of intuitionistic mathematics is most famous for his Fixed Point Theorem that does not admit a constructive proof. It was Orevkov [34] who proved in the sense of Markov's school that there is a computable counterexample and Baigger [3] later proved this result in terms of modern computable analysis.

Proposition 14 (Orevkov 1963, Baigger 1985). *There is a computable function $f : [0,1]^2 \to [0,1]^2$ without a computable $x \in [0,1]^2$ with $f(x) = x$.*

One can conclude from Proposition 5 that such a counterexample cannot exist in dimension $k = 1$. Baigger also used two c.e. sets that are computably inseparable for his construction.

Yet another theorem with interesting computability properties is the Theorem of Bolzano-Weierstraß.

Theorem 15 (Bolzano-Weierstraß). *Every sequence $(x_n)_n$ in the unit cube $[0,1]^k$ has a cluster point.*

It was Rice [39] who proved that a straightforward computable version of the Bolzano-Weierstraß Theorem does not hold and Kreisel pointed out in his review of this article for the Mathematical Reviews of the American Mathematical Society that he already proved a more general result [28].

Proposition 16 (Kreisel 1952, Rice 1954). *There exists a computable sequence $(x_n)_n$ in $[0,1]$ without a computable cluster point.*

In fact, this result is not all too surprising and a simple consequence of Proposition 3. What is more interesting is that in case of the Bolzano-Weierstraß Theorem there are even computable bounded sequences without *limit computable* cluster point. Here a point is called *limit computable* if it is the limit of a computable sequence. However, this was established only much later by Le Roux and Ziegler [31] (answering a question posed by Giovanni Lagnese on the email list *Foundations of Mathematics* [fom] in 2006).

Proposition 17 (Le Roux and Ziegler 2008). *There exists a computable sequence $(x_n)_n$ in $[0,1]$ without a limit computable cluster point.*

This is in notable contrast to all aforementioned results that all admit a limit computable solution for computable instances. For instance, the Monotone Convergence Theorem 2 itself implies that every monotone bounded sequence is convergent and hence every computable monotone bounded sequence automatically has a limit computable supremum. Hence, in a certain sense the Bolzano-Weierstraß Theorem is even less computable than all the other results mentioned in this section.

In this section we have only discussed a selection of theorems that can illustrate a certain variety of possibilities that occur. The computational content of several other theorems from real analysis has been studied. For instance Aberth [1] constructed a computable counterexample in the Russian sense for the Peano Existence Theorem for solutions of ordinary differential equations. Later Pour-El and Richards [37] constructed another counterexample in the modern sense of computable analysis for this theorem. The Riemann Mapping Theorem is an interesting example of a theorem from complex analysis that was studied by Hertling [23]. Now we turn to functional analysis.

3 Some Theorems from Functional Analysis

Starting with the work of Metakides, Nerode and Shore [32,33] theorems from functional analysis were studied from the perspective of computability theory. In particular the aforementioned authors studied the Hahn-Banach Theorem.

Theorem 18 (Hahn-Banach Theorem). *Let X be a normed space over the field $\mathbb{R}$ with a linear subspace $Y \subseteq X$. Then every linear bounded functional $f : Y \to \mathbb{R}$ has a linear bounded extension $g : X \to \mathbb{R}$ with $||g|| = ||f||$.*

Here $||f|| := \sup_{||x||\leq 1} |f(x)|$ denotes the operator norm. The result holds analogously over the field $\mathbb{C}$. Here and in the following a *computable metric space* X is just a metric space together with a dense sequence such that the distances can be computed on that sequence (as a double sequence of real numbers). If the space has additional properties or ingredients, such as a norm that generates the metric, then it is called a *computable normed space* or in case of completeness also a *computable Banach space*. If, additionally, the norm is generated by an inner product, then the space is called a *a computable Hilbert space*. A subspace

$Y \subseteq X$ is called *c.e. closed* if there is a computable sequence $(x_n)_n$ in X such that one obtains $\overline{\{x_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}} = Y$ (where the $\overline{A}$ denotes the closure of A). Metakides, Nerode and Shore [33] constructed a computable counterexample to the Hahn-Banach Theorem.

Proposition 19 (Metakides, Nerode and Shore 1985). *There exists a computable Banach space X over $\mathbb{R}$ with a c.e. closed linear subspace $Y \subseteq X$ and a computable linear functional $f : Y \to \mathbb{R}$ with a computable norm $||f||$ such that every linear bounded extension $g : X \to \mathbb{R}$ with $||g|| = ||f||$ is non-computable.*

Similarly, as the computability status of the Brouwer Fixed Point Theorem 13 was dependent on the dimension k of the underlying space $[0,1]^k$, the computability status of the Hahn-Banach Theorem 18 is dependent on the dimension and other aspects of the space X [10]. Nerode and Metakides [32] observed that for finite-dimensional X no counterexample as in Proposition 19 exists. However, even in this case the theorem is not uniformly computable [10]. Under all conditions that guarantee that the extension is uniquely determined, the Hahn-Banach Theorem is fully computable; this includes for instance all computable Hilbert spaces [10].

A number of further theorems from functional analysis were analyzed by the author of this article and these include the Open Mapping Theorem, the Closed Graph Theorem and Banach's Inverse Mapping Theorem [7,11]. Another theorem that falls into this category is the Uniform Boundedness Theorem [9]. These examples are interesting, since they behave differently from all aforementioned examples. We illustrate the situation using Banach's Inverse Mapping Theorem.

Theorem 20 (Banach's Inverse Mapping Theorem). *If $T : X \to Y$ is a bijective, linear and bounded operator on Banach spaces X, Y, then its inverse $T^{-1} : Y \to X$ is bounded too.*

Here we obtain the following computable version [11].

Proposition 21 (B. 2009). *If $T : X \to Y$ is a computable, bijective and linear operator on computable Banach spaces X, Y, then its inverse $T^{-1} : Y \to X$ is computable too.*

That is, every bijective and linear operator T with a program admits also a program for its inverse T^{-1}, but there is not general method to compute such a program for T^{-1} from a program for T in general as the following result shows [11].

Proposition 22 (B. 2009). *Inversion* $\mathsf{BIM} :\subseteq \mathcal{C}(\ell_2, \ell_2) \to \mathcal{C}(\ell_2, \ell_2), T \mapsto T^{-1}$ *restricted to bijective, linear and bounded $T : \ell_2 \to \ell_2$ is not computable (and not even continuous).*

Analogously, there is also a sequential counterexample [11].

Proposition 23 (B. 2009). *There exists a computable sequence $(T_n)_n$ of computable, bijective and linear operators $T_n : \ell_2 \to \ell_2$ such that the sequence $(T_n^{-1})_n$ of their inverses is not computable.*

Hence, in several respects the Banach Inverse Mapping Theorem behaves similarly to the Intermediate Value Theorem: it is non-uniformly computable, but not uniformly computable. Yet we will see that the uniform content of both theorems is different.

With our final example of a theorem from functional analysis we want to close the circle and mention a result that behaves similarly to the Monotone Convergence Theorem 2, namely the Fréchet-Riesz Representation Theorem.

Theorem 24 (Fréchet-Riesz Representation Theorem). *For every linear bounded functional $f : H \to \mathbb{R}$ on a Hilbert space H there exists a unique $y \in H$ such that $f = f_y$ and $||f|| = ||y||$, where $f_y : H \to \mathbb{R}, x \mapsto \langle x, y\rangle$.*

Here $\langle\ ,\ \rangle$ denotes the inner product of the Hilbert space H. For every computable $y \in H$ the functional f_y is computable with norm $||f_y|| = ||y||$. Since the norm $||y||$ is always computable for a computable $y \in H$, it is immediately clear that it suffices to construct a computable functional $f : H \to \mathbb{R}$ without a computable norm $||f||$ in order to show that this theorem cannot hold computably. In fact, a Specker-like counterexample suffices in this case [20].

Proposition 25 (B. and Yoshikawa 2006). *There exists a computable functional $f : \ell_2 \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $||f||$ is not computable and hence there cannot be a computable $y \in H$ with $f = f_y$ and $||f|| = ||y||$.*

4 A Classification Scheme for Theorems

If we look at the different examples of theorems that we have presented in the preceding sections then it becomes clear that theorems can behave quite differently with respect to computability. For one, the uniform and the non-uniform behavior can differ and the levels of computability can be of different complexities (computable, low, limit computable, etc.). On the other hand, certain theorems seem to be quite similar to each other, for instance the Monotone Convergence Theorem is similar in its behavior to the Fréchet-Riesz Theorem.

This naturally leads us to the question whether there is a classification scheme that allows to derive all sorts of computability properties of a theorem once it has been classified according to the corresponding scheme. The best known classification scheme for theorems in logic is Reverse Mathematics, i.e., the project to classify theorems in second order arithmetic according to certain axioms that are required to prove the corresponding theorem [40]. It turns out that this classification scheme is not fine enough for our purposes, because it only captures theorems in a non-uniform sense. In order to preserve computability properties such as lowness that are not closed under product, we also need a classification scheme that is more resource sensitive than reverse mathematics.

Such a classification scheme has been developed over the previous eight years using the concept of Weihrauch reducibility [21,35,36,14,13,12,16,18,15]. If X, Y, Z, W are represented spaces, then $f :\subseteq X \rightrightarrows Y$ is *Weihrauch reducible* to $g :\subseteq Z \rightrightarrows W$, if there are computable multi-valued functions H, K such that

$\emptyset \neq H(x, gK(x)) \subseteq f(x)$ for all $x \in \mathrm{dom}(f)$. In symbols we write $f \leq_{\mathrm{W}} g$ in this situation. If the reduction works in both directions, then we write $f \equiv_{\mathrm{W}} g$. It can be shown that this reducibility induces a lattice structure [14,36].

Now a theorem of logical form $(\forall x \in X)(x \in D \Longrightarrow (\exists y \in Y)\ P(x,y))$ can be interpreted as a multi-valued function $f :\subseteq X \rightrightarrows Y, x \mapsto \{y \in Y : P(x,y)\}$ with $\mathrm{dom}(f) = D$. For instance, we obtain the following multi-valued functions for the theorems that we have considered in the previous sections (some of which are formulated in greater generality here). Here Tr denotes the set of binary trees and $[T]$ the set of infinite paths of a tree T.

- $\mathsf{MCT} :\subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{R}, (x_n)_n \mapsto \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} x_n$ restricted to monotone bounded sequences.
- $\mathsf{IVT} :\subseteq \mathcal{C}[0,1] \rightrightarrows [0,1], f \mapsto f^{-1}\{0\}$ with $\mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{IVT}) := \{f : f(0) \cdot f(1) < 0\}$.
- $\mathsf{MAX}_X :\subseteq \mathcal{C}(X) \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}, f \mapsto \{x \in X : f(x) = \max f(X)\}$ for computably compact[3] computable metric spaces X and, in particular, for $X = [0,1]$.
- $\mathsf{WKL} :\subseteq \mathrm{Tr} \rightrightarrows 2^{\mathbb{N}}, T \mapsto [T]$ restricted to infinite binary trees.
- $\mathsf{BFT}_n : \mathcal{C}([0,1]^n, [0,1]^n) \rightrightarrows [0,1]^n, f \mapsto \{x : f(x) = x\}$ for $n \geq 1$.
- $\mathsf{BWT}_X :\subseteq X^{\mathbb{N}} \rightrightarrows X, (x_n)_n \mapsto \{x : x \text{ cluster point of } (x_n)_n\}$, restricted to sequences that are in a compact subset of X.
- $\mathsf{BIM}_{X,Y} :\subseteq \mathcal{C}(X,Y) \to \mathcal{C}(Y,X), T \mapsto T^{-1}$, restricted to bijective, linear, bounded T and for computable Banach spaces X, Y.
- $\mathsf{FRR}_H :\subseteq \mathcal{C}(H) \to H, f_y \mapsto y$ for computable Hilbert spaces H.
- $\mathsf{Z}_X :\subseteq \mathcal{C}(X) \to \mathbb{R}, f \mapsto f^{-1}\{0\}$ for computable metric spaces X.

We have not formalized the Hahn-Banach Theorem here and point the reader to [21]. The last mentioned problem Z_X is the *zero problem*, which is the problem to find a zero of a continuous function that admits at least one zero. By [19, Theorem 3.10] we obtain $\mathsf{Z}_X \equiv_{\mathrm{W}} \mathsf{C}_X$ for the *choice problem* of every computable metric space. We are not going to define C_X here, but whenever we use it we will actually take Z_X as a substitute for it. The following equivalences were proved in [13]:

Theorem 26 (Choice on the natural numbers). *The following are all Weihrauch equivalent to each other and complete among functions that are computable with finitely many mind changes [12]:*

1. *Choice on natural numbers* $\mathsf{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$.
2. *The Baire Category Theorem (in appropriate formulation).*
3. *Banach's Inverse Mapping Theorem* $\mathsf{BIM}_{\ell_2,\ell_2}$.
4. *The Open Mapping Theorem for* ℓ_2.
5. *The Closed Graph Theorem for* ℓ_2.
6. *The Uniform Boundedness Theorem for* ℓ_2.

Hence the equivalence class of choice $\mathsf{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$ on the natural numbers contains many theorems that are typically proved with and closely related to the Baire Category Theorem.

We prove that the Theorem of the Maximum is equivalent to the zero problem of $[0,1]$.

[3] See [19] for a definition of computably compact.

Theorem 27. $\mathsf{MAX}_X \equiv_{\mathrm{W}} \mathsf{Z}_X$ *for every computably compact computable metric space* X*.*

Proof. We prove $\mathsf{Z}_X \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \mathsf{MAX}_X$. Given a continuous function $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$ with $A = f^{-1}\{0\} \neq \emptyset$, we can compute the function $g : X \to \mathbb{R}$ with $g := -|f|$. Then $\mathsf{MAX}(g) = f^{-1}\{0\} = A$. This proves the claim. We now prove $\mathsf{MAX}_X \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \mathsf{Z}_X$. Given a continuous function $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$ with $\mathsf{MAX}(f) = A \neq \emptyset$, we can compute $g : X \to \mathbb{R}$ with $g := f - \max f(X)$, since X is computably compact. Now we obtain $g^{-1}\{0\} = \mathsf{MAX}(f) = A$. This proves the claim. □

We now arrive at the following result that is compiled from different sources. It shows that the equivalence class of choice on Cantor space contains several problems whose non-computably was proved with the help of Weak Kőnig's Lemma or with the help of two c.e. sets that are computably inseparable. We point out that the sequential version of the Intermediate Valued Theorem formulated in Proposition 6 can be modeled by *parallelization*. For $f :\subseteq X \rightrightarrows Y$ we define its *parallelization* $\widehat{f} :\subseteq X^{\mathbb{N}} \rightrightarrows Y^{\mathbb{N}}, (x_n)_n \mapsto \bigtimes_{n=0}^{\infty} f(x_n)$, which lifts f to sequences. Parallelization is a closure operation in the Weihrauch lattice [14].

Theorem 28 (Choice on Cantor space). *The following are all Weihrauch equivalent to each other and complete among non-deterministically computable functions with a binary sequence as advice [12]:*

1. *Choice on Cantor Space* $\mathsf{C}_{2^{\mathbb{N}}}$*.*
2. *Weak Kőnig's Lemma* WKL *[21,14].*
3. *The Theorem of the Maximum* $\mathsf{MAX}_{[0,1]}$ *(Theorem 27).*
4. *The Hahn-Banach Theorem (Gherardi and Marcone 2009) [21].*
5. *The parallelization* $\widehat{\mathsf{IVT}}$ *of the Intermediate Value Theorem [13].*
6. *The Brouwer Fixed Point Theorem* BFT_n *for dimension* $n \geq 2$ *[18].*

We note that [18] contains the proof for the Brouwer Fixed Point Theorem only for dimension $n \geq 3$ and the results for $n = 2$ is due to Joseph Miller. It is easy to see that $\mathsf{IVT} \equiv_{\mathrm{W}} \mathsf{BFT}_1$ [18]. We mention that this result implies Propositions 6, 9, 11, 14 and 19 and constitutes a more general uniform classification. In some cases the proofs can easily be derived from known techniques and results, in other cases (for instance for the Hahn-Banach Theorem and the Brouwer Fixed Point Theorem) completely new techniques are required. One can prove that the equivalence classes appearing in Theorems 26 and 28 are incomparable [13]. The next equivalence class that we are going to discuss is an upper bound of both.

We first prove that the Monotone Convergence Theorem MCT is equivalent to the Fréchet-Riesz Representation Theorem FRR_H.

Theorem 29. $\mathsf{FRR}_H \equiv_{\mathrm{W}} \mathsf{MCT}$ *for every computable infinite-dimensional Hilbert space* H*.*

Proof. Since every infinite-dimensional computable Hilbert space is computably isometrically isomorphic to ℓ_2 by [20, Corollary 3.7], if suffices to consider $H = \ell_2$. We first prove $\mathsf{FRR}_{\ell_2} \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \mathsf{MCT}$. Given a functional $f : \ell_2 \to \mathbb{R}$ we need to

find a $y \in \ell_2$ such that $f_y = f$ and $||y|| = ||f||$. There is a computable sequence $(x_n)_n$ in ℓ_2 such that $\overline{\{x_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}}$ is dense in $\{x \in \ell_2 : ||x|| \leq 1\}$. Hence $||f|| = \sup_{||x|| \leq 1} |f(x)| = \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |f(x_n)| = \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \max_{i \leq n} |f(x_i)|$ and hence we can compute $||f||$ with the help of MCT. Now given $f = f_y$ and $||f||$ we can easily compute y be evaluating $f_y(e_n)$ on the unit vectors e_n. We still need to prove $\mathsf{MCT} \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \mathsf{FRR}_{\ell_2}$. By [8, Proposition 9.1] it suffices to show that we can utilize FRR_{ℓ_2} to translate enumerations g of sets $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ into their characteristic functions. Let us assume that $A = \{n : n + 1 \in \mathrm{range}(g)\}$. Without loss of generality we can assume that no value different from zero appears twice in $(g(n))_n$. Using the idea of [20, Example 4.6] we choose $a_k := 2^{g(k)-1}$ if $g(k) \neq 0$ and $a_k := 0$ otherwise. Then $a = (a_k)_k \in \ell_2$ and we can compute $f \in \mathcal{C}(\ell_2)$ with $f(x) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} x_k a_k = \langle x, a \rangle$. Now, with the help of FRR_{ℓ_2} we obtain a $y \in \ell_2$ with $||y|| = ||f|| = ||a|| = \sqrt{\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |a_k|^2}$. But using the number $||y||^2$ we can decide A, since its binary representation has in the even positions the characteristic function of A. □

We note that FRR_H for finite-dimensional spaces H is computable. Altogether we obtain the following result for this equivalence class.

Theorem 30 (The limit). *The following are all Weihrauch equivalent to each other and complete for limit computable functions:*

1. *The limit map* $\lim$ *on Baire space [8].*
2. *The parallelization* $\widehat{\mathsf{C}_{\mathbb{N}}}$ *of choice on the natural numbers [13].*
3. *The parallelization* $\widehat{\mathsf{BIM}}$ *of Banach's Inverse Mapping Theorem [13].*
4. *The Monotone Convergence Theorem* MCT *[16].*
5. *The Fréchet-Riesz Representation Theorem* FRR *for* ℓ_2 *(Theorem 29).*
6. *The Radon-Nikodym Theorem (Hoyrup, Rojas, Weihrauch 2012) [24].*

This theorem implies Propositions 3, 23 and 25. Finally, we mention that we also have a concept of a *jump* $f' :\subseteq X \rightrightarrows Y$ for every $f :\subseteq X \rightrightarrows Y$, which essentially replaces the input representation of X in such a way that a name of $x \in X$ for f' is a sequence that converges to a name in the sense of f. This makes problems potentially more complicated since less input information is available. It allows us to phrase results as the following [16].

Theorem 31 (B., Gherardi and Marcone 2012). $\mathsf{WKL}' \equiv_{\mathrm{W}} \mathsf{BWT}_{\mathbb{R}}$.

This result does not only imply Proposition 17, but also the following [16].

Corollary 32 (B., Gherardi and Marcone 2012). *Every computable sequence* $(x_n)_n$ *in the unit cube* $[0,1]^n$ *has a cluster point* $x \in [0,1]^n$ *that is low relative to the halting problem.*

Here x is *low relative to the halting problem* if $x' \leq_{\mathrm{T}} \emptyset''$ (some authors would only call this a partial relativization of lowness). In light of Proposition 17 this is one of the strongest positive properties that one can expect for a cluster point. These examples demonstrate that a classification of the Weihrauch degree of a theorem yields a large variety of computability properties of the theorem, uniform and non-uniform ones on the one hand, and positive and negative ones on the other hand.

References

1. Aberth, O.: The failure in computable analysis of a classical existence theorem for differential equations. Proceedings of the AMS 30, 151–156 (1971) 5
2. Avigad, J., Brattka, V.: Computability and analysis: the legacy of Alan Turing. In: Downey, R. (ed.) Turing's Legacy: Developments from Turing's Ideas in Logic, LNL, vol. 42, pp. 1–47. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK (2014) 1, 2
3. Baigger, G.: Die Nichtkonstruktivität des Brouwerschen Fixpunktsatzes. Archive for Mathematical Logic 25, 183–188 (1985) 4
4. Beeson, M.J.: Foundations of Constructive Mathematics. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics, Springer, Berlin (1985) 3
5. Borel, É.: Le calcul des intégral définies. Journal de Mathematiques pures et appliquées 8(2), 159–210 (1912) 1
6. Borel, É.: La théorie de la mesure et al théorie de l'integration. In: Leçons sur la théorie des fonctions, pp. 214–256. Gauthier-Villars, Paris, 4 edn. (1950) 1
7. Brattka, V.: Computability of Banach space principles. Informatik Berichte 286, FernUniversität Hagen, Fachbereich Informatik, Hagen (Jun 2001) 6
8. Brattka, V.: Effective Borel measurability and reducibility of functions. Mathematical Logic Quarterly 51(1), 19–44 (2005) 10
9. Brattka, V.: Computable versions of the uniform boundedness theorem. In: Chatzidakis, Z. et al. (eds.) Logic Colloquium 2002. LNL, vol. 27, pp. 130–151. ASL, Urbana (2006) 6
10. Brattka, V.: Borel complexity and computability of the Hahn-Banach Theorem. Archive for Mathematical Logic 46(7–8), 547–564 (2008) 6
11. Brattka, V.: A computable version of Banach's inverse mapping theorem. Annals of Pure and Applied Logic 157, 85–96 (2009) 6
12. Brattka, V., de Brecht, M., Pauly, A.: Closed choice and a uniform low basis theorem. Annals of Pure and Applied Logic 163, 986–1008 (2012) 7, 8, 9
13. Brattka, V., Gherardi, G.: Effective choice and boundedness principles in computable analysis. Bull. Symbolic Logic 17(1), 73–117 (2011) 7, 8, 9, 10
14. Brattka, V., Gherardi, G.: Weihrauch degrees, omniscience principles and weak computability. The Journal of Symbolic Logic 76(1), 143–176 (2011) 7, 8, 9
15. Brattka, V., Gherardi, G., Hölzl, R.: Probabilistic computability and choice. Information and Computation 242, 249–286 (2015) 7
16. Brattka, V., Gherardi, G., Marcone, A.: The Bolzano-Weierstrass theorem is the jump of weak Kőnig's lemma. Ann. Pure Appl. Logic 163, 623–655 (2012) 7, 10
17. Brattka, V., Hertling, P., Weihrauch, K.: A tutorial on computable analysis. In: Cooper, S.B. et al. (eds.) New Computational Paradigms: Changing Conceptions of What is Computable, pp. 425–491. Springer, New York (2008) 2
18. Brattka, V., Le Roux, S., Pauly, A.: Connected choice and the Brouwer fixed point theorem. arXiv 1206.4809 (Jun 2012), `http://arxiv.org/abs/1206.4809` 7, 9
19. Brattka, V., Presser, G.: Computability on subsets of metric spaces. Theoretical Computer Science 305, 43–76 (2003) 8
20. Brattka, V., Yoshikawa, A.: Towards computability of elliptic boundary value problems in variational formulation. J. Complexity 22(6), 858–880 (2006) 7, 9, 10
21. Gherardi, G., Marcone, A.: How incomputable is the separable Hahn-Banach theorem? Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic 50(4), 393–425 (2009) 7, 8, 9
22. Grzegorczyk, A.: Computable functionals. Fundamenta Mathematicae 42, 168–202 (1955) 3

23. Hertling, P.: An effective Riemann Mapping Theorem. Theoretical Computer Science 219, 225–265 (1999) 5
24. Hoyrup, M., Rojas, C., Weihrauch, K.: Computability of the Radon-Nikodym derivative. Computability 1(1), 3–13 (2012) 10
25. Jockusch, C.G., Soare, R.I.: Π^0_1 classes and degrees of theories. Trans. AMS 173, 33–56 (1972) 4
26. Kleene, S.C.: Recursive functions and intuitionistic mathematics. In: Proc. Int. Cong. Math., Cambridge, 1950, vol. 1. pp. 679–685. AMS, Providence (1952) 3
27. Ko, K.I.: Complexity Theory of Real Functions. Progress in Theoretical Computer Science, Birkhäuser, Boston (1991) 2
28. Kreisel, G.: On the interpretation of non-finitist proofs. II. Interpretation of number theory. Applications. J. Symbolic Logic 17, 43–58 (1952) 4
29. Lacombe, D.: Remarques sur les opérateurs récursifs et sur les fonctions récursives d'une variable réelle. C. R. Acad. Paris 241, 1250–1252 (Nov 1955), théorie des fonctions 3
30. Lacombe, D.: Les ensembles récursivement ouverts ou fermés, et leurs applications à l'Analyse récursive. C. R. Acad. Paris 245, 1040–1043 (1957), logique 3
31. Le Roux, S., Ziegler, M.: Singular coverings and non-uniform notions of closed set computability. Mathematical Logic Quarterly 54(5), 545–560 (2008) 5
32. Metakides, G., Nerode, A.: The introduction of non-recursive methods into mathematics. In: Troelstra, A., Dalen, D.v. (eds.) The L.E.J. Brouwer Centenary Symposium. pp. 319–335. North-Holland, Amsterdam (1982) 5, 6
33. Metakides, G., Nerode, A., Shore, R.A.: Recursive limits on the Hahn-Banach theorem. In: Rosenblatt, M. (ed.) Errett Bishop: Reflections on Him and His Research. Contemp. Math. vol. 39, pp. 85–91. AMS, Providence (1985) 5, 6
34. Orevkov, V.P.: A constructive mapping of the square onto itself displacing every constructive point (Russian). Doklady Akademii Nauk 152, 55–58 (1963), translated in: Soviet Math. - Dokl., 4 (1963) 1253–1256 4
35. Pauly, A.: How incomputable is finding Nash equilibria? Journal of Universal Computer Science 16(18), 2686–2710 (2010) 7
36. Pauly, A.: On the (semi)lattices induced by continuous reducibilities. Mathematical Logic Quarterly 56(5), 488–502 (2010) 7, 8
37. Pour-El, M.B., Richards, J.I.: A computable ordinary differential equation which possesses no computable solution. Annals Math. Logic 17, 61–90 (1979) 5
38. Pour-El, M.B., Richards, J.I.: Computability in Analysis and Physics. Springer, Berlin (1989) 2
39. Rice, H.G.: Recursive real numbers. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 5, 784–791 (1954) 4
40. Simpson, S.G.: Subsystems of Second Order Arithmetic. Cambridge University Press, Poughkeepsie, second edn. (2009) 7
41. Specker, E.: Nicht konstruktiv beweisbare Sätze der Analysis. The Journal of Symbolic Logic 14(3), 145–158 (1949) 2
42. Specker, E.: Der Satz vom Maximum in der rekursiven Analysis. In: Heyting, A. (ed.) Constructivity in mathematics. pp. 254–265. North-Holland, Amsterdam (1959) 2, 3
43. Turing, A.M.: On computable numbers, with an application to the "Entscheidungsproblem". Proc. London Math. Soc. 42(2), 230–265 (1937) 1, 2
44. Turing, A.M.: On computable numbers, with an application to the "Entscheidungsproblem". A correction. Proc. London Math. Soc. 43(2), 544–546 (1938) 1
45. Weihrauch, K.: Computable Analysis. Springer, Berlin (2000) 2, 3
46. Zaslavskiĭ, I.D.: Disproof of some theorems of classical analysis in constructive analysis (Russian). Usp. Mat. Nauk 10(4), 209–210 (1955) 3